

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed July 16, 2003 wherein claims 1-17 were rejected under USC §103 (a) over Richard et al. (US 5,990,681) in view of Chesneau et al. (US 4,686,473). Further in the Office Action, Figures 1-5 were objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 and 1.152. In this amendment, the specification was amended and the drawings were amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-17 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The specification was amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error in paragraph 0027. The drawings have been amended in response to the Draftsperson Notice attached to the Office Action. Figure 1 was corrected to remove machine marks. Figure legends, figure numbers and characters have been corrected on all figures and page numbers have been removed. Figure 3 has been amended to correct for line thickness and to correct for an arrowhead inadvertently superimposed on data "c". Figures 4 and 5 have been corrected for missing lead lines and faded data. Applicants respectfully submit the drawings as corrected are now in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84 and 1.152 and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.


The rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 USC §103 (a) over the combination of the Richard and Chesneau references is respectfully traversed. Independent claims 1 and 12 each recite a plurality of conductive array elements being substantially parallel to a conductive ground plane and a plurality of capacitors, wherein at least one capacitor is shunted from each array element to the ground plane to adjust a corresponding electrical length of each conductive array element. The combination of each respective array element, at least one corresponding capacitor and the ground plane forms a resonator that resonates at a selected frequency. Applicants' recited invention is particularly well-adapted for parallel imaging using a conductive coil array where there is typically a need to balance the physical length of the array elements and the electrical wavelength depending on the MRI magnetic field strength and scanner length. The Richard reference discloses a whole-body RF detector array comprising a plurality of conductive array elements. The Chesneau reference discloses an RF coil assembly comprising a number of conductors spaced evenly about a circular cylinder and further discloses at col. 6, lines 52-62 a plurality of capacitors for tuning. Nowhere does the Richard or Chesneau reference teach, show or suggest a plurality of capacitors being shunted from each array element to adjust a corresponding electrical length of each array element as particularly recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 12.

For a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must set forth the differences in the claim over the applied references, set forth the proposed modification of the references which would be necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and explain why the proposed modification would be obvious. Applicants interpret the Office Action as stating that the proposed modification is to combine the detector array of Richard et al. with the capacitors of Chesneau et al. However, the Examiner has not suggested what the motivation would be for this combination. Applicants respectfully submit that the Richard and Chesneau references do not show, suggest or teach the recited capacitors shunted from each array element for adjusting a corresponding electrical length of the array element. By contrast, the Examiner's suggested combination for combining conductive array elements (e.g. from Richard) with capacitors (of Chesneau) would suggest the combination for tuning purposes, but there is no suggestion, teaching or disclosure regarding the need to adjust electrical length. The fact that two references can be combined is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants' respectfully submit that no reasonable combination of the Richard and Chesneau references would obtain Applicants' recited invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the recited invention in claims 1 and 12, and claims depending therefrom, is patentable over the Richard and Chesneau references. Therefore, Applicants' respectfully submit that claims 1-17 are allowable and requests that the rejections under 35 USC §103 (a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and for the reasons set out above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,


Jean K. Testa
Reg. No. 39,396

General Electric Company
Building K1, Room 4A71
Schenectady, New York 12301

Oct. 15, 2003

Telephone: (518) 387-5115 or
(518) 387-7122